

1 Ellen Jean Winograd, Esq.
2 State Bar No. 815
3 WOODBURN AND WEDGE
4 6100 Neil Road, Ste. 200
5 Reno, NV 89509
6 Tel: 775-323-5700
7 Fax: 775-688-3088
8 Email: ewinograd@woodburnandwedge.com

6 Attorneys for Defendant
7 WESTERN RANGE ASSOCIATION

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 ABEL CÁNTARO CASTILLO;
11 ALCIDES INGA RAMOS, RAFAEL DE LA
12 CRUZ, and those similarly situated,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

15 WESTERN RANGE ASSOCIATION;
16 EL TEJON SHEEP COMPANY; MELCHOR
17 GRAGIRENA; MOUNTAIN PLAINS
18 AGRICULTURAL SERVICE; and ESTILL
19 RANCHES, LLC,

20 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:16-cv-00237-RCJ-VPC

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
REPORT AND PROPOSED
STIPULATED DISCOVERY PLAN**

Date: October 15, 2019
Time: 10:00 a.m.

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT REPORT AND
PROPOSED STIPULATED DISCOVERY PLAN**

I. SHORT STATEMENT OF THE NATURE OF THE CASE

22 This putative class action complaint was originally filed on May 3, 2018. Plaintiff Abel
23 Cántaro Castillo alleged various causes of action for unpaid wages on behalf of himself and all
24 “similarly situated” individuals against El Tejon Sheep Company, Melchor Gragirena and
25 Western Range Association [Doc #1]. The Second Amended Complaint, again before this court,
26 includes the following claims:

- 27 • Failure to Pay Minimum Wages in Violation of the Nevada Constitution

- 1 • Breach of Contract or Quasi-Contract
- 2 • Promissory Estoppel
- 3 • Unjust Enrichment and Quantum Meruit
- 4 • Failure to Pay Separated Employees Wages When Due

5 **II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

6 Plaintiff Cántaro first filed suit against WRA, El Tejon and Gragirena on May 3, 2016.
 7 [Doc #1]. On September 16, 2016, Western Range Association and El Tejon both filed
 8 Motions to Dismiss. [Doc #35, #37]. On October 13, 2016, Plaintiff/Appellant Cántaro, plus
 9 newly-named Plaintiff Ramos filed the First Amended Complaint, wherein additional
 10 defendants were added. [Doc #45]. Seventeen (17) new causes of action also appeared. *Id.*
 11 The FAC omitted the (federal) *Fair Labor Standards Act* (“FLSA”) cause of action previously
 12 asserted in the original Complaint. *Id.*

13 Defendants El Tejon, Gragirena, and WRA filed “Motions to Dismiss” the FAC all of
 14 which were granted by this Court, finding that the District Court lacked jurisdiction [Doc
 15 #107]. Specifically, the Court held that CAFA and federal question jurisdiction were lacking
 16 and dismissed the Plaintiff’s claims.

17 Plaintiffs Abel Cántaro Castillo, Alcides Inga Ramos and Rafael De La Cruz filed the
 18 Second Amended Complaint on May 15, 2017. [Doc #111]. Following Motions to Dismiss
 19 the SAC by all Defendants, this District Court issued its Order and Opinion on February 13,
 20 2018 dismissing the entire SAC for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. [Doc #140]. In its
 21 dismissal Order, the District Court held that the minimum amount in controversy requirement
 22 under 28 USC § 1332 (CAFA diversity of citizenship) was absent. [Doc #140] The District
 23 Court then dismissed the SAC without prejudice but without leave to amend. [Doc #140].

24 Plaintiff filed his Notice of Appeal in this matter on March 9, 2018. [Doc #147].¹

25 ¹ While the appeal was pending, Plaintiff Castillo settled his claims against El Tejon and
 26 Melchor Gragirena and proceeds only against WRA. Plaintiff Ramos settled his claims against
 27 Estill Ranch and MPAS, and all three parties are no longer part of this case. Plaintiff De La
 28 Cruz did not appeal.

Following briefing and argument, in a 2-1 unpublished decision (with dissenting opinion) the Ninth Circuit reversed and remanded the case back to this Court. The mandate was entered by this Court on August 8, 2019. [Doc #170].

III. PREVIOUS SCHEDULING ORDER

A prior scheduling order was entered in this case on January 13, 2017 [Doc #91], permitting discovery to begin, although motions to dismiss were pending. On April 13, 2017, after the FAC was dismissed, Plaintiffs filed the SAC on May 15, 2017, but no new scheduling order was entered, and no further discovery occurred prior to July 14, 2017, when all parties entered a stipulation for a Stay pending outcome on the Motions to Dismiss. The stipulation was approved by the Court on July 28, 2017 and an order entered thereon.

At the time of the April 13 dismissal order, there were 254 days of discovery remaining. The parties propose a new scheduling order which provides for 254 days of additional discovery, as contemplated by the original scheduling order.

IV. PROPOSED SCHEDULING ORDER (SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED)

The parties propose the following dates for completion of pretrial matters.

Document	Deadline Date
Defendant's Responsive Pleading	October 31, 2019
Discovery Opens	October 31, 2019
Amending the Pleadings and Adding Parties	January 27, 2020
Expert Disclosures	April 24, 2020
Rebuttal-Expert Disclosures	May 28, 2020
Motion for Class Certification	June 1, 2020
Discovery Cut-Off	July 1, 2020
Dispositive Motions Filed	July 28, 2020
Pretrial Order	August 27, 2020

1 **IV. PROPOSED TRIAL DATES**

2 October 13, 2020 October 20, 2020 October 26, 2020

3 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

4 Dated October 7, 2019

5 By: /s/ Christine E Webber

6 Mark R. Thierman, Esq.

7 Joshua D. Buck, Esq.

8 Leah L. Jones, Esq.

9 THIERMAN BUCK

7287 Lakeside Drive

Reno, NV 89511

10 Alexander Hood (*pro hac vice*)

11 TOWARDS JUSTICE

1535 High Street, Suite 300

12 Denver, CO 80218

13 Christine E. Webber (*pro hac vice*)

14 Brian Corman (*pro hac vice*)

COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL PLLC

1100 New York Ave., NW, Suite 500

15 Washington, D.C. 20005

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

Dated October 7, 2019

By: /s/ Ellen Jean Winograd

Ellen Winograd, Esq.

Joshua Woodbury, Esq.

WOODBURN & WEDGE

6100 Neil Road, Suite 500

Reno, NV 89505

*Attorneys for Defendant Western Range
Association*

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated this ____ day of October, 2019.

19
20
21 ROBERT C. JONES

22 Senior District Judge